

ago by the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals—the integration of a browser/Microsoft operating system, a major step forward in technology and convenience for all of the purchasers of that system.

It is easy to understand why the district court judge didn't want to go back to a higher court that he had directly defied, but that is no justifiable reason for skipping a District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court, I am delighted to say, agrees with that proposition.

This matter is now on its normal way through the appeals process, a process that I am confident will justify, in whole or in major part, the Microsoft Corporation, but only at great expense and at a great expenditure of time.

Once again, I call on this administration or on its successor to see the error of its ways in bringing this lawsuit in the first place. It has been damaging to innovation in the most rapidly changing technology in our society, one that has changed all of our lives more profoundly, I suspect, than any other in the course of our lifetimes. It is immensely damaging to our international competitiveness, encouraging, as it does, similar lawsuits by countries around the world that would love to slow down Microsoft's competitive innovation so they could catch up.

This is a field about which 10 or 15 years ago we despaired. Today, we are clearly the world leaders. For our own Government to be hobbling our own competitiveness is particularly perverse. It opens up the proposition that innovations in software will have to be approved by Justice Department lawyers before they can be offered to consumers in a way that seems to me to be perverse.

It doesn't take a great deal of courage to say that I trust Microsoft software developers in their own field more than I do Justice Department lawyers. At best, this was a private lawsuit, effectively brought on behalf of Microsoft competitors but being paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, where it should have, had it gone to court at all, been just that—a private lawsuit in which the Federal Government had little or no interest.

So, good news from the Supreme Court but news that can be greatly improved by a new administration's fresh look and the dismissal of its case in its entirety.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATOR PAT ROBERTS' 100TH PRESIDING HOUR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, I have the pleasure to announce that

Senator PAT ROBERTS has achieved the 100 hour mark as Presiding Officer. In doing so, Senator ROBERTS has earned his second Gold Gavel Award.

Since the 1960's, the Senate has recognized those dedicated Members who preside over the Senate for 100 hours with the golden gavel. This award continues to represent our appreciation for the time these dedicated Senators contribute to presiding over the U.S. Senate—a privileged and important duty.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend our sincere appreciation to Senator ROBERTS and his diligent staff for their efforts and commitment to presiding duties during the 106th Congress.

#### INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of this body to some very important negotiations that are underway.

We have debated many important subjects in this Congress as it comes to a close. Some of those larger subjects have been attempts to create a prescription drug benefit for the Nation, how should we go about doing that. We have had a long and intense debate on education. We have had debates on the privacy issue, on bankruptcy reform.

One of the debates in which we have engaged that has captured the attention of many people around the Nation—Governors and mayors, local elected officials, chambers of commerce, outdoor enthusiasts, environmentalists across the board—is our debate about how we should allocate a small portion of this surplus; what is the proper way to allocate that to preserve and enhance the environment of our Nation.

As we begin this century, this is a debate worth having because if we make the wrong decision, it will set us on a path where we will not be happy to end up. We need to make a good decision now. We are in the very crux of making that decision, as appropriators on both sides debate the final outcome of this year's Interior appropriations bill.

I urge Senators to pay attention, as carefully as they can, to the ongoing debates on how to allocate this funding.

On the one hand, there is a group saying: Let's just do more of the same. As it comes to our environment, we don't need to do anything differently. Let's just do more of the same. Let's just give a little more money to some Federal agencies to allocate the funding, and let's just come every year and decide year in and year out if we want to or if we don't, and how that money should be allocated.

There is a group of us called Team CARA, representing the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, which has been negotiating since the beginning of this Congress for a better way—a way that will bring more money to States on a guaranteed basis, money that Governors and mayors and local elected officials can count on—a revenue sharing

bill, if you will, for the environment. It is something that will turn in a direction that will set us on a new and bold and exciting course.

I thank the President for his tremendous statements in the last couple of days urging Congress to move in this direction. He is urging us to do everything we can to make CARA—the Conservation and Reinvestment Act—the model. For the RECORD, I will submit something in which some States would be interested. I will be handing out this form later today.

For instance, if we stick with the old method, Colorado would receive \$3.6 million. It is a beautiful State with wonderful environmental needs. They would get \$3.6 million. Under CARA, if it is passed, Colorado could receive \$46 million a year, and the Governor and local elected officials would have input into how it was spent.

Let's take Georgia. Under this bill, this year they would get a measly \$500,000. Under CARA, they would be guaranteed a minimum of \$32 million a year.

Let's take Kentucky. Again, they would get a measly \$500,000 in this year's environmental bill. Under CARA, they would get a guarantee of \$15 million a year for the preservation of open spaces, for wildlife conservation, and for the expansion of our parks and recreation.

Let's take Minnesota. Minnesota gets nothing in the bill being negotiated. Under CARA, they would get \$29 million a year.

I will be submitting the details because I am here to say let's allow the best proposal to win in this debate. Let us fight it on its merits. Let us discuss the benefits of CARA. These are some of the benefits that I am outlining.

New Jersey is one of our most populated States—the Garden State, a State that has just levied on its people a billion dollar bond issue to preserve open spaces. People in New Jersey feel strongly about this. Under the old way, the way the negotiators are carving this up, they get a measly \$875,000. Under CARA, they would receive \$40 million a year.

Let's take New York, another large State. They would get \$2.8 million in the bill being negotiated, but if we stick to our guns and fight hard for CARA, New York could get \$17 million a year. Most certainly, the population deserves those kinds of numbers.

Finally, Washington State is a beautiful State, one that has a history of leading us in the environmental area. Washington gets fairly well treated in this bill with \$12.7 million. Under CARA, if we hold true to the principles, Washington State could get \$47 million a year. That is a big difference for the people of Washington State—from \$12.7 million to \$47 million. I could go on.

Under CARA, we have a guarantee. Under the current negotiations, the same that has gone on for the last 25 years, there is no guarantee. I am saying that under CARA we can have full